

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

AIDA M. HENDERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

LYFT, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

No. 4:23-cv-00376-JMB

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on its own motion. On March 29, 2023, the Court ordered plaintiff Aida M. Henderson to show cause as to why her case should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (Docket No. 4). She was given twenty-one days to respond, and advised that her failure to comply would result in the dismissal of this action without prejudice and without further notice.

The Court did not receive a show cause response from plaintiff. Instead, on April 12, 2023, mail sent to plaintiff was returned as undeliverable. (Docket No. 5). The return envelope indicated that the mail could not be forwarded. Because a new address could not be verified, the mail was not re-sent.


Local Rule 2.06(B) requires every self-represented party to promptly notify the Clerk of Court of any change in address. The rule further provides that “[i]f any mail to a self-represented plaintiff or petitioner is returned to the Court without a forwarding address and the self-represented plaintiff or petitioner does not notify the Court of the change of address within thirty (30) days, the Court may, without further notice, dismiss the action without prejudice.” E.D. Mo. L.R. 2.06(B).

In this case, more than thirty days have elapsed since plaintiff's mail was returned as undeliverable. Plaintiff has not provided her new address, nor submitted anything further to the Court. As such, the Court will dismiss this action without prejudice.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice. *See* E.D. Mo. L.R. 2.06(B). A separate order of dismissal will be entered herewith.

Dated this 15th day of May, 2023.



RODNEY W. SIPPEL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE